1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT TACOMA 9 LAUREL PARK COMMUNITY, LLC, a Washington No. 3:09-cv-05312-BHS limited liability company; TUMWATER ESTATES 10 INVESTORS. California limited partnership; **SUPPLEMENTAL** VELKOMMEN MOBILE PARK, LLC, a Washington 11 **DECLARATION OF** limited liability company; and MANUFACTURED ROBERT EICHLER IN 12 HOUSING COMMUNITIES OF WASHINGTON, a SUPPORT OF PARTIAL Washington non-profit corporation, SUMMARY JUDGMENT 13 Plaintiffs. 14 V. 15 CITY OF TUMWATER, a municipal corporation, 16 Defendant. 17 Robert Eichler declares and states as follows: 18 I am over the age of eighteen, competent to testify, and familiar with the facts 19 herein. 20 2. I am the sole member of plaintiff Laurel Park Community, LLC, which owns 21 22 Laurel Park, a manufactured housing community located in Tumwater, Washington. I purchased 23 Laurel Park in 1991. I have purchased, sold, and managed various manufactured home 24 communities since 1982. 25 Talmadge/Fitzpatrick Supp. Declaration of Robert Eichler - 1

- 3. I do not expect a windfall from this action. In fact, I just want what I had before Tumwater enacted its MHP ordinance.
- 4. I also do not expect a windfall from my ownership and operation of Laurel Park. I purchased Laurel Park for its current rental revenue and for a meaningful choice of other land uses that generate income or increase its resale value. I anticipated using the property as a mobile home park and then expected to be able to turn to other economically productive uses at my discretion, or sell the property if it became economically unviable when a higher and better use opportunity presented itself. I did not expect that either the County or the City would require that I continue to use the property as a manufactured home community in perpetuity, or that they would effectively accomplish the same result by allowing me to choose between using my property for one economically viable use (a manufactured housing community), or request a conditional use permit to use other primarily public or institutional uses that do not generate profit.
- I have always expected that I would share in my portion of public obligations, and I am proud to have offered the residents of Laurel Park the opportunity to purchase an affordable home and place it on my land. But, I never expected that I would be required by Tumwater to shoulder more than my share of any public obligation to provide affordable housing, or that Tumwater would later exercise its zoning power to require that I either continue to make my property available as affordable housing, or "choose" another public use that is not viable. When I invested in Laurel Park, neither Tumwater nor any other local government in Washington required that I choose between one use that generates revenue, and other uses which generate little or no revenue. I had no reason to believe that would change until Tumwater passes its MHP Ordinance.

6. Before Tumwater passed its MIP ordinance, my property rights did not allow Tumwater to require that I choose between realizing an income from the property, or realizing no income in any other permitted usc. After Tumwater passed its ordinance, I now have a choice that is no choice. The difference is what I expected when I invested in Laurel Park, and do not now have. The difference is also how Laurel Park has been damaged by the MHP ordinance. I purchased Laurel Park expecting to use it as a mobile home park while that remained a viable personal and business decision, and then expected to be able to turn to other economically productive uses at my discretion, or sell the property if it became economically unviable when a higher and better use opportunity presented itself.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at free Florish, this 3 day of March, 2011.

Robert Eichler

Decimation of Robert Eichler - 3